



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/764,560	12/12/1996	JUN KAKUTA	1083.1027/JD	4899

21171 7590 06/21/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/764,560

Applicant(s)

KAKUTA ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 04/05/02 for the application filed on 12/12/96.
2. Claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 21, 25, 26, and 27 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-26 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi and Covington have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' argument.
4. The rejections of claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi and Covington and further in view of Person have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' argument.
5. The rejections of claims 13-15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi, Covington and Person and further in view of Microsoft have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103 (c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (US Pat No. 5,659,791, 8/19/97) in view of Khoyi et al. (US Pat No. 5,421,015) and Frank et al. (US Pat No. 5,651,107, 7/22/97, filed 8/16/94, priority 12/15/92).

With respect to independent claim 17, Nakajima discloses:

-- obtaining information from the external application program in accordance with the result of the analysis (col 2, lines 20-43; col 1, lines 46-61, the scrap object is integrated into a destination document or transferred between applications via a clipboard after the information is selected to be extracted from the document)

-- creating an information object in accordance with the obtained information and attribute information which includes object ID, object type and information type (col 6, lines 25-28, encapsulating of the selected information into an object is created automatically by the system to encapsulate the selected information in response to extracting and that is stored in the memory; col 5, lines 64-67, an object is a combination of data structure that hold *attribute data* and *functions that act upon the*

attribute data; col 6, lines 64-67, giving a name for an object for referencing the object, which means each object must have an ID; col 5, lines 55-58, recognizing of the information type to handle the reintegration of an object)

It is noted that the “analyzing an event” step is inherently included in Nakajima since the obtaining step is performed in accordance with the result of the analysis.

Nakajima does not disclose the priority for showing of objects, time stamp, object link which are able to be modified after being created as an information object. Nakajima also does not disclose showing the information object such that the information object appears different from any non-selected information in the external program.

Khoyi discloses:

- the object catalog including the object table and link table (figure 5)
- the object table includes object identifiers, object type and object location (figure 6)
- the link table includes link ID, link type, parent object identifiers, child object identifiers (figure 7)
- the linking of data objects (col 3, lines 12-20; col 43, lines 1-11)
- the ability of editing of the moved or copied objects (col 43, lines 66-67; col 44, lines 1-5)
- the changing the manner of drawing the information object on the basis of the attribute information (col 3, lines 22-36)
- *a new object is created at will by a user by modifying the object prototype in the object prototype table to change the characteristics of the object (col 3, lines 37-48, when the characteristics of an object is changed, the appearance of the object should be changed. In other words, the appearance of the selected object is different from the non-selected object)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Khoyi into Nakajima to have the information objects, for user selecting of information, which include object ID, object type, object link and the ability of modifying objects after created. As disclosed, the attribute information includes object ID, object type and object link, parent object ID and child object ID which are object ID of next object, thus motivating the including of the priority for showing objects and time stamp, which are other information data related to the object.

In addition, the fact that Nakajima shows that the information is selected as requested, transferred and integrated into a document of another application implies that the system can analyze an event for selecting information as well as creating an information object as desired.

In addition, Nakajima and Khoyi do not disclose a ***transparent window*** through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen.

Frank discloses a transparent window through which the content of the document beneath that window is seen (figure 7, the transparent window overlays the mail list document window and the content of the mail list document is seen through the transparent window).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Frank to include the information controlled by the external application to the content of the document in the window beneath the transparent window since in Frank the application in the window beneath the transparent window is *different* from the application in the transparent window. This motivates that the application of the window beneath the transparent window can be an external one. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Frank into Nakajima and Khoyi to provide a

transparency mechanism to present information, and easily view and edit information such that a user can see through a window to view and manipulate underlying data that would normally be obscured.

With respect to claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima does not explicitly disclose returning the content of the selected information object to the original external application program from which the information object has been obtained or a specified external application program which is different from the original external application program.

Instead Nakajima discloses that the information is selected to be extracted from the document and transferred to a clipboard provided in the operating system using the scrap object. The selected information then is transferred from the clipboard to an application (col 1, lines 55-62). Nakajima also discloses that after the scrap object is created, it may be subsequently integrated into a document, including the document from which it originated (col 4, lines 53-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Nakajima to include the returning feature above to Nakajima because Nakajima provides the clipboard for transferring selected information between applications which include the original application and the application different from the original application.

Claim 21 is for a computer readable program code to perform the steps in claim 17, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 2 and 3 are the system for performing the step in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 is the program code means for performing the step in claim 18, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to independent claim 1, Nakajima discloses, as in claim 17:

-- storing contents and attribute information of an information object to be shown, the attribute information being concerned with showing the information object and including object ID, object type, information type (col 6, lines 25-28, the selected information is created automatically by the system in response to extracting and these objects are stored in the memory; col 5, lines 64-67, an object is a combination of data structure that hold attribute data and functions that act upon the attribute data; col 6, lines 64-67, giving a name for an object for referencing the object which means each object must have an ID; col 5, lines 55-58, recognizing of the information type to handle the reintegration of an object)

-- drawing information object on said transparent window in accordance with the content and attribute information relating to the display of the object stored in said information storing unit, and changing a manner of drawing the information object on the basis of the attribute information (col 3, lines 37-48, modifying objects by changing the objects' characteristics)

-- performing at least any one of processes including a process of controlling said information storing unit, a process of controlling said message transmitting unit and a process of controlling said drawing unit, in accordance with the result of the analysis reported from said event analyzing unit (col 2, lines 20-43; col 1, lines 46-61; col 3, lines

25-35; (the information is selected, transferred and integrated into another document using a scrap object as a vehicle for interapplication transfer of information))

-- transmitting a control message to an external application program in order to get a selected information in the external application program (col 2, lines 20-43; col 1, lines 46-61; col 3, lines 25-35; transmitting messages is inherently included in the performing step, otherwise information selection, transferring, or integrating can not be performed)

-- analyzing all the events from an operation system and reporting a result of the analysis (col 2, lines 55-60, operating system provides code for a clipboard and code for implementing a user interface; col 3, lines 25-40, role of the mouse and the operating system in the drag-and-drop mechanism used to create a scrap object in which the movement of the mouse, the depression and the release of the mouse button, each constitutes an event that is translated by the operating system into a message, and the operating system post most of the mouse messages into a message queue for a currently executing application program; reporting a result of the analysis is inherently included in the performed step since the performing step is carried out in accordance with the result of the analysis)

Nakajima does not disclose the priority for showing of objects, time stamp, object link which are able to be modified after being created as an information object. Nakajima also does not disclose showing the information object such that the information object appears different from any non-selected information in the external program.

Khoyi discloses:

-- the object catalog including the object table and link table (figure 5)

-- the object table includes object identifiers, object type and object location (figure 6)

-- the link table includes link ID, link type, parent object identifiers, child object identifiers (figure 7)

- the linking of data objects (col 3, lines 12-20; col 43, lines 1-11)
- the ability of editing of the moved or copied objects (col 43, lines 66-67; col 44, lines 1-5)
- the changing the manner of drawing the information object on the basis of the attribute information (col 3, lines 22-36)
- *a new object is created at will by a user by modifying the object prototype in the object prototype table to change the characteristics of the object (col 3, lines 37-48, when the characteristics of an object is changed, the appearance of the object should be changed. In other words, the appearance of the selected object is different from the non-selected object)*

Nakajima and Khoyi do not disclose displaying on a window displaying information controlled by an external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen.

Frank discloses a transparent window through which the content of the document beneath that window is seen (figure 7, the transparent window overlays the mail list document window and the content of the mail list document is seen through the transparent window).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Frank to include the information controlled by the external application to the content of the document in the window beneath the transparent window since in Frank the application in the window beneath the transparent window is *different* from the application in the transparent window. This motivates that the application of the window beneath the transparent window can be an external one. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Frank into Nakajima and Khoyi to provide a

transparency mechanism to present information, and easily view and edit information such that a user can see through a window to view and manipulate underlying data that would normally be obscured.

Independent claim 25 includes part of limitations of claims 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 26 is for the computer-readable program code for the method claim 25, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 27 includes limitations disclosed in claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

9. Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi and Frank as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Person (*Using Windows 3.1*, 1993).

With respect to claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima, Khoyi, and Frank do not disclose the editing of the contents of the selected information objects after created.

Person discloses the editing the contents of the embedded objects in a document (p.235, 236, 521, 522).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Person to Nakajima because Nakajima shows the

Art Unit: 2176

transferring selected information objects and Person shows the editing the selected information objected after created.

With respect to claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, Nakajima shows the combining objects when a scrap object integrated into another object of other document. Nakajima also discloses the class object that refers to a group of objects thus all scrap objects belong to the scrap object class have the same type of attributes and functions (col 3, lines 1-12). Nakajima does not show the editing process including moving objects, deleting objects, changing objects and creating objects.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have included moving, deleting, changing and creating objects since it was well known that a user can (a) move an object from one location to another by using the drag-and-drop mechanism, (b) delete an object by highlighting the object and pressing the delete key, (c) change an object by highlighting a portion of the object and pressing the delete key to remove that portion, (d) to create a new information object by selecting a portion of an object and save It under a different name.

Claim 23 is a computer program code means to perform the functions of claim 19, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is a computer program code means to perform the functions of claim 20, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 4-10 are for the means included in the system to perform the functions disclosed in claim 20, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, it was well known when a selected text or graphics is moved, the rest of the document is moved to maintain the relative location in the document.

With respect to claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, the fact that a file subdirectory containing a plurality of files including the index file, if the index files is selected and deleted, the whole subdirectory is deleted, can be applied to the object group as claimed.

With respect to claim 16, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima does not disclose that an information object belonging to any one of information object groups and an information object which does not belong to any information object group are shown on the window by different ways. Person discloses the document including the information selected from different applications. The display of the whole document is different from the display of only the information from Microsoft Excel which are the graph and the table (page 208). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Person into Nakajima because Person shows the display of the combined document, including text and graphics, which is different from the document from Excel which includes only the graph and table.

10. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi, Frank and Person as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Microsoft (*Microsoft Windows User's Guide*, 1992).

With respect to claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Nakajima, Khoyi and Person do not disclose the relationship of an information object in the information object group, when selected, is canceled.

Microsoft discloses that when deleting a link from an Cardfile object embedded in a Write document, both the link to the drawing and the drawing are removed from the document (p. 502).

With respect to claims 14 and 15, Nakajima, Khoyi, Person and Microsoft do not disclose that when the two objects are selected and the hierarchical relationship is given to the selected information objects to form the information object group, and when one of them is deleted, the other is removed, too.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified to include in Nakajima, Khoyi, Person and Microsoft said forming the information object group based on the selected objects and their given hierarchical relationship and said deleting feature since it was well known that if two selected objects has a hierarchical relationship, when one is deleted, the other is removed, too due to the inheritance.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Covington does not disclose a transparent window since the content of the document in the main window beneath the video window can not be seen.

Examiner agrees.

Frank, in combination with Nakajima and Khoyi, discloses a transparent window overlaying another window wherein the applications in the two windows are different (figure 7; col 8, lines 15-63).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Noguchi et al. (US Pat No. 5,469,189, 11/21/95).

Takai (US Pat No. 5,933,843, 8/3/99, filed 10/11/96).

Okamoto et al. (US Pat No. 6,088,481, 7/11/00, filed 6/30/95).

Dozier et al. (US Pat No. 6,393,469 B1, 5/21/02, filed 12/2/98, priority 3/28/95).

Arend et al. (US Pat No. 6,012,073, 1/4/00, filed 10/21/96).

Frank et al. (US Pat No. 5,999,191, 12/7/99, filed 9/25/96, priority 12/15/92).

Frank et al. (US Pat No. 6,384,840 B1, 5/7/02, filed 9/17/99, priority 12/15/92).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong Lac Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

14. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)


or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

clh

6/5/02


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER